

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Proposed Action analyzed in the ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Statement is implementation of the Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Resource Management Plan, jointly-developed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Puget Sound treaty tribes, under Limit 6 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4(d) Rule for implementation in the ~~2004 2005~~–2009 fishing years, beginning May 1, ~~2004 2005~~ (May 1, ~~2004 2005~~ – April 30, 2010). The proposed Resource Management Plan would regulate commercial, recreational, ceremonial, and subsistence salmon fisheries potentially affecting the listed Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit within the marine and freshwater areas of Puget Sound, from the entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca inward. It excludes Washington Commercial Salmon Management Catch Reporting Area 4B during the months from May to September, when this area is under the jurisdiction of the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Harvest objectives specified in the Resource Management Plan account for fisheries-related mortality of Puget Sound chinook salmon throughout the migratory range of this species – from Oregon and Washington to Southeast Alaska. The Resource Management Plan also includes implementation, monitoring, and evaluation procedures designed to ensure that fisheries are consistent with the objectives of the Resource Management Plan for conservation and use. Fishery activities under the Resource Management Plan would affect the listed Puget Sound Chinook Salmon and Hood Canal Summer-Run Chum Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Units. Salmon abundance is highly variable from year to year, both among chinook populations and other salmon species, requiring managers to formulate fisheries to respond to the population abundance conditions particular to that year. Therefore, the Resource Management Plan does not include the specific details of an annual fishing regime – i.e., where and when fisheries occur; what gear will be used; or how harvest is allocated among gears, areas, or fishermen. However, the Resource Management Plan does provide the framework and objectives against which the co-managers must develop their annual action-specific fishing regimes to protect Puget Sound chinook salmon and meet other management objectives.

The purpose and need for the Proposed Action (Section 1) is to provide for harvest of salmon species in Puget Sound marine and freshwater areas that:

- Ensures the sustainability of Puget Sound chinook salmon by conserving the productivity, abundance and diversity of the populations within the Puget Sound Chinook Evolutionarily Significant Unit
- Protects treaty Indian fishing rights and meets federal treaty trust responsibilities
- Provides equitable sharing of harvest opportunity among tribes, and among treaty and non-treaty fishers pursuant to U.S. v. Washington and U.S. v. Oregon

- 1 • Meets the requirement of Limit 6 of the 4(d) Rule under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) by:
2 “. . . not appreciably reducing the likelihood of survival and recovery” of ESA listed Puget Sound
3 chinook (50 CFR 223.203[b][6][i]).
- 4 • Manages risk associated with abundance estimation, population dynamics, and management
5 implementation
- 6 • Optimizes harvest of abundant Puget Sound salmon (coho, chinook, sockeye, pink, chum) while
7 protecting weaker commingled chinook stocks
- 8 • Accounts for all sources of fishery-related mortality
- 9 • Achieves the guidelines for allocation of harvest benefits and conservation objectives for chinook
10 salmon under the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

11 Since the Puget Sound Chinook Evolutionarily Significant Unit was listed in 1999, the National Marine
12 Fisheries Service (NMFS) has evaluated the impact of Alaskan, Canadian and southern U.S. salmon
13 fisheries affecting listed Puget Sound chinook under section 7 of the ESA, and evaluated fisheries
14 resource management plans in 2001 and 2003 for listed Puget Sound chinook under the 4(d) Rule Limit
15 6. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews were also conducted on the 2001 and 2003
16 Resource Management Plans as part of the overall assessment of those Resource Management Plans.
17 The current application of Limit 6 to the 2003 Resource Management Plan ~~expires~~expired May 1,
18 2004. The co-managers jointly-developed another harvest RMP for Puget Sound commercial and
19 recreational salmon, and steelhead net fisheries taking listed Puget Sound chinook for the 2004–2009
20 fishing seasons which began May 1, 2004. NMFS conducted a consultation under Section 7 of the ESA
21 and issued a Biological Opinion in June of 2004 that the 2004 fishing season was not likely to
22 jeopardize the Puget Sound Chinook ESU (NMFS 2004). The co-managers provided the RMP to
23 NMFS, and NMFS is evaluating the RMP under Limit 6 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) section
24 4(d) rule for the 2005–2009 fishing season, beginning May 1, 2005.

25 Application of Limit 6 to the proposed Resource Management Plan would ensure that in conducting
26 fishery activities, the co-managers would not be subject to ESA take prohibitions because these
27 activities would be conducted in a way that contributes to conserving the listed Evolutionarily
28 Significant Units, or would be governed by regulations that adequately limit impacts to listed salmon.
29 For NMFS to apply the provisions of Limit 6 for implementing a Resource Management Plan, the co-
30 managers must jointly prepare a fishing plan that meets the requirements defined under Limit 6 of the
31 4(d) rule. NMFS must then make a determination pursuant with the government-to-government
32 processes of the Tribal 4(d) Rule that the Resource Management Plan, as proposed and implemented by
33 the co-managers, does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of listed Puget

1 Sound chinook (50 CFR 223.203[b][6][i]). The NMFS determination under the 4(d) Rule is the major
2 Federal action that triggers review under NEPA (NOAA Administrative Order 216.603(e)[2][a]).

3 Washington Trout, a Puget Sound environmental group, challenged the adequacy of the NEPA
4 Environmental Assessment used by NMFS for its determination for the 2001 Puget Sound Chinook
5 Harvest Resource Management Plan (Washington Trout v. Lohn, No. C01-1863R, Western District,
6 Washington). As part of the settlement agreement reached with Washington Trout (July 22, 2002),
7 NMFS agreed to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for its 2004 determination related to a
8 long-term Resource Management Plan.

9 The alternatives considered and analyzed in this ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Statement were
10 formulated based on scientific information, alternatives described in the settlement agreement in
11 Washington Trout v. Lohn, and public comments received during the scoping process for the
12 Environmental Impact Statement on the ~~2004~~ Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Resource Management
13 Plan. Several alternatives suggested by the public were eliminated from further consideration because
14 they did not meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action or were contained within the
15 alternatives that were considered in more detail. It should be noted that Alternative 4 is also
16 inconsistent with several elements of the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, and would not be
17 considered were it not one of the alternatives identified for analysis in the settlement agreement to
18 Washington Trout v. Lohn. In the analyses, Alternative 4 provides an upper-bound estimate of the
19 decrease in mortality on fish and wildlife species affected by Puget Sound salmon fisheries, and an
20 upper-bound estimate of socio-economic effects. A description of the Proposed Action and alternatives
21 is provided in Section 2, Alternatives Including the Proposed Action. The alternatives considered for
22 detailed analyses are:

- | | | |
|----|----------------|--|
| 23 | Alternative 1: | The Proposed Action (the proposed Resource Management Plan) |
| 24 | Alternative 2: | Escapement goal management at the management unit level with no restriction |
| 25 | | on where fisheries may take place |
| 26 | Alternative 3: | Escapement goal management at the individual population level with terminal |
| 27 | | fisheries only |
| 28 | Alternative 4: | No authorized take of listed Puget Sound chinook salmon within the Strait of |
| 29 | | Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound area. |

30 NEPA requires disclosure of how current environmental and social conditions would change with the
31 Proposed Action or its alternatives. For this analysis, the Proposed Action (Alternative 1) most closely
32 approximates current salmon harvest management practices and baseline environmental conditions,
33 because the same type of harvest management plan has been implemented since 2000–2001. Therefore,

Alternative 1 is the baseline against which the environmental, social, and economic consequences of the action are compared. The predicted direct and indirect effects of alternatives on baseline environmental conditions (Alternative 1) are described in Section 4, Environmental Consequences, along with predicted cumulative effects on the natural, built and human environment when combined with other related actions.

The predicted outcome of implementing any of the alternatives evaluated in this ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Statement will depend on the Puget Sound chinook salmon abundance available to the fisheries in any individual year, and the amount of Puget Sound chinook harvest taken in Canadian and Alaskan fisheries prior to chinook salmon reaching Puget Sound fisheries. Canadian fisheries, which are outside the jurisdiction of U.S. fishery management agencies, account for 25 to 80 percent of the fishing-related mortality for most chinook populations within Puget Sound. Each alternative was evaluated for four scenarios that captured the general range in magnitude of abundance and the level of Puget Sound chinook salmon harvest in Canadian and Alaskan fisheries that is reasonably expected to occur across the duration of the Proposed Action (the ~~2004~~ 2005–2009 fishing seasons), in order to capture the range of predicted impacts of the Proposed Action or alternative. A more detailed discussion of the basis and choice of these scenarios is presented in Subsection 4.2 of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Basis for Comparison of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives Analysis.

Scenario	Abundance	Canadian/Alaskan Fisheries
Scenario A	2003 Puget Sound abundance	2003 Canadian/Alaskan fisheries harvest.
Scenario B	2003 Puget Sound abundance	High Canadian/Alaskan fisheries harvest.
Scenario C	30% reduction from 2003 abundance	2003 Canadian/Alaskan fisheries harvest.
Scenario D	30% reduction from 2003 abundance	High Alaskan/Canadian fisheries harvest.

The indications of a plateau or potential reduction in marine survival (the primary influence on abundance), and expectations that Canadian fisheries will continue to increase as they have in recent years, led the Interdisciplinary Team to conclude that Scenario B is the *most likely* to occur during implementation of the Proposed Action. However, the other scenarios followed the same general patterns of impact when comparing among alternatives for each resource.

The ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Statement examines the predicted effects of the Proposed Action and three alternatives on a range of issues including fish species (salmon and non-salmon), federal treaty trust responsibilities, subsistence use, economics, environmental justice and wildlife

(Section 4, Environmental Consequences). From the information provided in this ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Regional Administrator of the NMFS Northwest Region must decide:

- 1) Which harvest management strategy to adopt for salmon fisheries that take listed Puget Sound chinook salmon in Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca that would meet the requirements for Limit 6 of the 4(d) take prohibition
- 2) If a harvest strategy other than that proposed by the co-managers is preferred, whether to limit the geographic location of salmon fisheries that take listed Puget Sound chinook within the Puget Sound Action Area.

CEQ Regulations (§1502.14[e]) require that the agency “Identify the [agency’s] preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft [environmental impact] statement...unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.” The Environmentally Preferable Alternative “ordinarily, means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural and natural resources” (CEQ 40 Most Asked Questions, No. 6a). The Preferred Alternative is the alternative NMFS believes best fulfills the purpose and need for the Proposed Action. The Preferred Alternative and the Environmentally Preferable Alternative need not be the same. NMFS may take into account various other considerations in choosing its Preferred Alternative, including such factors as the agency’s statutory mission and responsibilities, and economic, environmental, technical, and social factors.

The following factors weighed most heavily in NMFS’ decision concerning the Agency Preferred Alternative and the Environmentally Preferable Alternative: 1) effects on fish, and in particular the ESA-listed Puget Sound chinook salmon; 2) various levels of restriction on tribal treaty rights (from voluntary to mandated) and trust responsibilities, and the subsequent effects thereon; 3) treaty Indian ceremonial and subsistence uses; 4) various levels of environmental justice effects on Puget Sound tribes; 5) stable or increasingly adverse economic impacts to fishing communities; 6) secondary effects of fishing resulting from interactions of hatchery salmon that escape fisheries with wild salmon (i.e., straying); and 7) fishing-related impacts to fish habitat. For other resources evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (wildlife, ownership and land use, water quality), there were no or very small differences among the alternatives, or uncertainty in the outcome precluded assessment of the effect (see Section 5, Identification of the Environmentally Preferable and Agency Preferred Alternative, for further details).

Alternative 1, the Proposed Action, is the NMFS’ preferred alternative because NMFS believes this alternative would be most successful at balancing resource conservation, trust obligations to Native

1 American tribes, promotion of sustainable fisheries and prevention of lost economic potential
2 associated with overfishing, declining species and degraded habitats. NMFS did not choose Alternative
3 4, the Environmentally Preferable Alternative, as its preferred alternative due to: 1) the anticipated
4 substantial adverse impacts to tribal treaty rights, treaty Indian ceremonial and subsistence fishing uses,
5 environmental justice effects, and economic effects on fishing communities predicted for this
6 alternative; 2) the expected reduction in adverse biological impacts from implementation of Alternative
7 4 were not predicted to be substantial enough to outweigh the losses in these other areas, particularly
8 for listed Puget Sound chinook salmon; and 3) failure to achieve the purpose and need for the Proposed
9 Action.

10 NEPA regulations and guidance indicate that agencies have discretion in choosing a preferred
11 alternative different from the environmentally preferred alternative “based on relevant factors including
12 economic and technical considerations and agency statutory missions” (40 CFR 1505.2[b]). NMFS has
13 three primary mandates with regard to this Proposed Action: 1) implement the ESA; 2) carry out its
14 federal trust responsibilities with Native American tribes, including protecting the exercise of federally-
15 recognized treaty tribal fishing rights and; 3) provide for sustainable fishing opportunity. In addition,
16 Presidential Executive Orders require that NMFS minimize conflicts between its implementation of the
17 ESA and exercise of tribal activities (E.O. 13175), e.g., treaty reserved fishing rights, and fishing (E.O.
18 12962). The Secretarial Order (DOI Order 3206) requires that any restrictions of tribal fishing under
19 the ESA 1) be reasonable and necessary for the conservation of the species at issue; 2) occur only when
20 the conservation purpose of the restriction cannot be achieved by reasonable regulation of non-Indian
21 activities; 3) be the least restrictive alternative available to achieve the conservation purpose; 4) not
22 discriminate against Indian activities either as stated or implied; and 5) that voluntary tribal measures
23 are not adequate to achieve the necessary conservation purpose. NMFS staff has proposed to conclude
24 that Alternative 1 (the Proposed Action) would not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival or
25 recovery of listed Puget Sound chinook salmon¹. Therefore, the further reductions in fisheries, and
26 tribal fisheries specifically, that would occur with implementation of Alternative 2, 3, or 4 are not
27 required to meet ESA requirements, and would represent an unreasonable and unnecessary constraint
28 on the exercise of federally-recognized treaty fishing rights. In addition, the approach represented in
29 Alternative 1 is more robust overall to management error and key uncertainties in environmental
30 parameters (see Subsection 4.3.8, Fish: Indirect and Cumulative Effects) and therefore should better

¹ NMFS’ Proposed 4(d) Evaluation and Determination for the Puget Sound chinook resource management plan is currently undergoing public comment and review.

1 protect salmonid resources evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement and better promote
2 sustainable fishing opportunities.

3 Under the most likely scenario to occur over the duration of the Proposed Action (the ~~2004~~ 2005–2009
4 fishing seasons), implementation of Alternative 2, 3, or 4 is predicted to result in the loss of more than
5 94 percent of the local and regional sales, employment, and personal income generated by commercial
6 salmon fishing associated with the Puget Sound fishery. Reductions in sport fishing-related economic
7 activity would range from 12 to 72 percent (see Subsection 4.6, Economic Activity and Value:
8 Environmental Consequences). These predicted effects would be most severe in communities
9 dependent upon commercial and sport fishing activities. Combined with substantial declines in fishing
10 industries that these communities have already experienced over the past 20 years, these predicted
11 effects would further affect the character and viability of these communities, especially tribal
12 communities (see Subsections 4.5, Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses:
13 Environmental Consequences; and 4.7, Environmental Justice: Environmental Consequences). The
14 primary basis for the identification of Alternative 4 as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative was
15 the increased abundance in fish species. Alternative 4 (as well as Alternative 2 or 3) would provide for
16 substantially larger escapements of salmonids, larger abundance of forage fish, and a slightly greater
17 possibility of rebuilding some individual listed Puget Sound chinook populations more quickly.
18 However, given the discussion above, it is unclear what realistic effect this would have on the status of
19 salmonid populations. NMFS has tentatively concluded that Alternative 1 will meet ESA requirements.
20 Management objectives for the other salmonid species are also predicted to be met. Since Alternative 1
21 also provides for the conservation needs of these resources, NMFS does not consider the predicted
22 reduction in adverse biological impacts from the implementation of Alternative 4 substantial enough to
23 outweigh the significant economic losses that would be prevented under Alternative 1.

24 Finally, NEPA regulations require that the selected alternative be consistent with the purpose and need
25 for the Proposed Action. Alternative 4 would be inconsistent with several elements of the purpose and
26 need for the Proposed Action, and would not have been considered were it not one of the alternatives
27 identified for analysis in the settlement agreement to Washington Trout v. Lohn. It would not: 1)
28 provide for the meaningful exercise of federally protected treaty fishing rights; 2) provide for tribal and
29 non-tribal fishing opportunity co-managed under the jurisdiction of U.S. v Washington; or 3) optimize
30 harvest of abundance of Puget Sound salmon while protecting weaker commingled chinook salmon
31 stocks.

List of Acronyms

CCEG	Current-condition escapement goal
CEQ	President's Council on Environmental Quality
CET	Critical escapement threshold
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWT	Coded-wire tag (or tagged)
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER	Exploitation rate
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FIRE	Finance, Insurance and Real Estate sectors
FR	Federal Register
FRAM	Fisheries Regulation Assessment Model
IMPLAN	Impact Analysis and Planning Professional (Minnesota IMPLAN Group)
LIFT	License and Fish Ticket database (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife)
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFP	Northwest Forest Plan
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPFMC	North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
NWIFC	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
PBR	Potential Biological Removal value
PFMC	Pacific Fisheries Management Council
PSAMP	Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program
PSC	Pacific Salmon Commission
PST	Pacific Salmon Treaty
RER	Recovery exploitation rate
RMP	Resource Management Plan
SFA	Sustainable Fisheries Act
TMOSNRT	<i>TENYO MARU</i> Oil Spill Natural Resources Trustees
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VET	Viable escapement threshold

VSP	Viable Salmonid Population guidelines
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WTP	Willingness to pay
WWTIT	Western Washington Treaty Indian Tribes

Table of Contents

GLOSSARY.....	xxviii
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION.....	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Summary of the Proposed Action.....	1-3
1.3 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action.....	1-3
1.4 Background to Purpose and Need	1-4
1.5 ESA 4(d) Rule and Limit 6.....	1-10
1.6 Fisheries Affecting Puget Sound Chinook Salmon.....	1-12
1.7 Regulatory Jurisdictions Affecting Washington Fisheries.....	1-25
1.8 Environmental Review Process.....	1-26
1.8.1 Public Scoping.....	1-26
1.8.2 Issues and Concerns Raised During Scoping	1-27
1.9 Decisions to be Made.....	1-27
1.10 Relationship to Other Plans	1-28
1.10.1 Pacific Salmon Treaty Annexes	1-28
1.10.2 Pacific Coast Framework Management Plan	1-28
1.10.3 Puget Sound Salmon Management Plan	1-29
1.10.4 Puget Sound Recovery Planning	1-29
1.10.5 Wild Salmonid Policy.....	1-29
1.10.6 Gravel to Gravel	1-30
1.11 Roles and Responsibilities of the Federal Government, State and Tribes in Fisheries Management ...	1-30
1.11.1 Federal Agencies	1-30
1.11.2 Tribes	1-31
1.11.3 State Agencies	1-31
1.12 Overview of the NEPA Environmental Impact Statement.....	1-32
2.0 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study	2-2
2.2.1 Tribal-Only Fisheries	2-2
2.2.2 No Hatchery Augmentation	2-3
2.2.3 Exploitation Rate Management	2-3

2.3	Alternatives Considered in Detail	2-3
2.3.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	2-6
2.3.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management	2-13
2.3.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	2-15
2.3.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	2-19
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.2	Environmental Setting	3-2
3.2.1	Physical Description of the Action Area	3-5
3.2.2	Resident Population within the Action Area	3-8
3.2.3	Evolutionarily Significant Units within the Action Area	3-9
3.3	Fish	3-14
3.3.1	Threatened and Endangered Species	3-14
3.3.1.1	Puget Sound Chinook	3-16
3.3.1.2	Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca Chum Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>)	3-61
3.3.1.3	Listed Columbia River Chinook Salmon	3-67
3.3.1.4	Bull Trout (<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>)	3-67
3.3.1.5	Listed Columbia River Chum Salmon	3-68
3.3.2	Unlisted Salmonids	3-68
3.3.2.1	Puget Sound and Olympic Peninsula Coho Salmon (<i>O. kisutch</i>)	3-68
3.3.2.2	Puget Sound Sockeye Salmon (<i>O. nerka</i>)	3-73
3.3.2.3	Washington Coastal Chinook and Unlisted Columbia River Chinook	3-75
3.3.2.4	Puget Sound Chum Salmon (Unlisted)	3-76
3.3.2.5	Puget Sound Steelhead (<i>O. mykiss</i>)	3-76
3.3.2.6	Puget Sound Pink Salmon (<i>O. gorbuscha</i>)	3-78
3.3.3	Non-Salmonid Fishes (Groundfish)	3-80
3.3.4	Forage Species (Pacific Herring, Sandlance, Smelt)	3-81
3.3.5	Fish Habitat Affected by Salmon Fishing	3-82
3.3.6	Marine-Derived Nutrients from Salmon Spawners	3-86
3.3.7	Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon	3-94
3.3.8	Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects on Salmon	3-115
3.3.8.1	Effects of Hatchery-Origin Chinook on Natural-Spawning Chinook Salmon	3-115
3.3.8.2	Overfishing	3-121

3.4	Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibilities	3-122
3.4.1	Introduction.....	3-122
3.4.2	Federal–Tribal Relations	3-122
3.4.3	The Trust Responsibility.....	3-123
3.4.4	Indian Treaty Rights in Puget Sound.....	3-123
3.4.5	Tribal Regulation and Usual and Accustomed Grounds and Stations.....	3-125
3.4.6	Limitations on the Exercise of Indian Treaty Rights	3-126
3.5	Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses	3-128
3.5.1	Historic Fisheries.....	3-130
3.5.1.1	The Ethnographic Record	3-130
3.5.1.2	Tribal Areas, Reservation Locations, and the Importance of Salmon.....	3-132
3.5.1.3	Post Treaty Period Fishing	3-133
3.5.2	Contemporary Fisheries	3-135
3.5.2.1	Salmon Species, Availability, and Cultural Preferences	3-135
3.5.2.2	Fishing Areas	3-135
3.5.2.3	Gear	3-136
3.5.3	Salmon Uses and the Cultural Significance of Salmon	3-136
3.5.3.1	Use, Distribution and Sharing.....	3-136
3.5.3.2	Tribes and Relationship to Salmon: Responsibility and Stewardship.....	3-140
3.5.3.3	The Transmission of Fishing Culture.....	3-141
3.5.3.4	Other Activities That Underscore The Significance of Salmon in Contemporary Indian Culture	3-142
3.5.3.5	Summary	3-143
3.6	Economic Activity and Value.....	3-144
3.6.1	Commercial Salmon Harvesting and Processing	3-145
3.6.1.1	Salmon Harvesting.....	3-145
3.6.1.2	Processing of Commercial Salmon Catch	3-154
3.6.2	Sport Fishing Activity, Catch, and Value	3-155
3.6.3	Regional Economic Activity	3-161
3.6.3.1	Strait of Juan de Fuca/North Hood Canal Region	3-162
3.6.3.2	North Puget Sound.....	3-163
3.6.3.3	South Puget Sound/South Hood Canal.....	3-163
3.6.3.4	Three-Region Summary	3-171
3.7	Environmental Justice	3-173

3.7.1	Background	3-173
3.7.2	Methodology.....	3-173
3.7.2.1	Establish the Target Area.....	3-174
3.7.2.2	Identify the Population Areal Unit	3-174
3.7.2.3	Identify the Target Population.....	3-174
3.7.2.4	Identify the Reference Area.....	3-174
3.7.2.5	Define Disproportionate Effect.....	3-174
3.7.2.6	Identify Environmental Justice Area(s) of Concern	3-175
3.7.3	Public Outreach to Identify Significant Minority and/or Low-Income Groups.....	3-175
3.7.4	Low Income Populations	3-175
3.7.5	Racial Minorities	3-176
3.7.6	Indian Tribes.....	3-178
3.8	Wildlife.....	3-180
3.8.1	Marine Habitats	3-180
3.8.2	Marine Birds	3-186
3.8.2.1	Rhinoceros Auklet	3-186
3.8.2.2	Common Murre	3-187
3.8.2.3	Pigeon Guillemot	3-189
3.8.2.4	Gulls and Terns	3-190
3.8.2.5	Grebes, Loons, and Cormorants	3-191
3.8.2.6	Sea Ducks	3-193
3.8.3	Marine Mammals.....	3-194
3.8.3.1	Harbor Seal	3-195
3.8.3.2	California Sea Lion.....	3-195
3.8.3.3	Gray Whale	3-197
3.8.3.4	Killer Whale	3-198
3.8.3.5	Harbor Porpoise and Dall's Porpoise	3-199
3.8.3.6	Sea Otter	3-200
3.8.4	Benthic Invertebrates	3-201
3.8.5	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-202
3.8.5.1	Marbled Murrelet	3-202
3.8.5.2	California Brown Pelican	3-203
3.8.5.3	Bald Eagle	3-204
3.8.5.4	Steller Sea Lion.....	3-205

3.8.5.5	Humpback Whale/Fin Whale	3-205
3.8.5.6	Pacific Leatherback Turtle	3-206
3.9	Ownership and Land Use – Parks and Recreation	3-207
3.10	Water Quality	3-209
3.10.1	Turbidity and Sedimentation.....	3-210
3.10.2	Non-Point Source Pollution	3-210
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Basis for Comparison of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives Analysis	4-3
4.2.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-3
4.2.2	Technical Approach to Impact Assessment	4-4
4.2.3	Scenarios for Alternatives	4-5
4.2.3.1	Abundance	4-5
4.2.3.2	Canadian and Alaskan Fisheries.....	4-6
4.3	Fish	4-9
4.3.1	Threatened and Endangered Fish Species	4-9
4.3.1.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-16
4.3.1.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-21
4.3.1.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level.....	4-24
4.3.1.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-27
4.3.1.5	Summary Discussion of Alternatives	4-30
4.3.2	Unlisted Salmonid Species.....	4-54
4.3.2.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-55
4.3.2.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-57
4.3.2.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level With Terminal Fisheries Only	4-60
4.3.2.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-64
4.3.3	Non-Salmonid Fish Species	4-67
4.3.4	Fish Habitat	4-68
4.3.5	Marine-Derived Nutrients from Spawning Salmon	4-70
4.3.5.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-71
4.3.5.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-74
4.3.5.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-76

4.3.5.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-77
4.3.6	Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon	4-79
4.3.6.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-80
4.3.6.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-84
4.3.6.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-85
4.3.6.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-86
4.3.7	Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects On Salmon: Straying and Overfishing.....	4-87
4.3.7.1	Straying of Hatchery Chinook.....	4-88
4.3.7.2	Straying of Coho and Chum Salmon.....	4-102
4.3.8	Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....	4-104
4.3.8.1	Indirect Effects.....	4-104
4.3.8.2	Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action or Alternatives on Fish Species.....	4-109
4.4	Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibility.....	4-120
4.4.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-120
4.4.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-121
4.4.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-122
4.4.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-123
4.4.5	Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....	4-124
4.5	Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses	4-125
4.5.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-127
4.5.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-128
4.5.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only.	4-129
4.5.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-130
4.5.5	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.....	4-131
4.5.5.1	Indirect Effects.....	4-131
4.5.5.2	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-133
4.6	Economic Activity and Value.....	4-135
4.6.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-137
4.6.1.1	Summary of Scenario Differences.....	4-137
4.6.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-137
4.6.2.1	Summary of Scenario Differences.....	4-137

4.6.2.2	Comparison of the Management Unit-Based Escapement Alternative (Alternative 2) to the Proposed Action.....	4-138
4.6.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-139
4.6.3.1	Summary of Scenario Differences.....	4-139
4.6.3.2	Comparison of the Population Unit-Based Escapement Alternative (Alternative 3) to the Proposed Action	4-140
4.6.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-141
4.6.4.1	Summary of Scenario Differences.....	4-141
4.6.4.2	Comparison of the No Action/No Authorized Take Alternative (Alternative 4) to the Proposed Action	4-141
4.6.5	Summary.....	4-143
4.6.6	Cumulative Effects	4-165
4.7	Environmental Justice	4-169
4.7.1.	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-175
4.7.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-177
4.7.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level.....	4-180
4.7.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take, Scenario B.....	4-182
4.7.5	Comparison of the Effects of Management Alternatives on the Tribes.....	4-183
4.7.6	Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....	4-185
4.7.6.1.	Indirect Effects.....	4-185
4.7.6.2	Cumulative Effects	4-185
4.8	Wildlife.....	4-189
4.8.1	Marine Birds	4-189
4.8.1.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-193
4.8.1.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-194
4.8.1.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-194
4.8.1.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-194
4.8.2	Marine Mammals.....	4-195
4.8.2.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-197
4.8.2.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-197
4.8.2.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-198
4.8.2.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-199
4.8.3	Marine Invertebrates	4-199

4.8.3.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-200
4.8.3.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-200
4.8.3.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-200
4.8.3.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-200
4.8.4	Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species	4-200
4.8.4.1	Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo	4-202
4.8.4.2	Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level	4-202
4.8.4.3	Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only	4-203
4.8.4.4	Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take	4-203
4.8.5	Wildlife Indirect Effects	4-203
4.8.6	Cumulative Effects on Wildlife	4-206
4.9	Ownership and Land Use – Parks and Recreation	4-216
4.10	Water Quality	4-217
4.10.1	Sedimentation and Turbidity.....	4-217
4.10.2	Non-Point Source Pollution	4-217
5.0	IDENTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE AND AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES	5-1
5.1	Impacts Summary	5-1
5.2	Identification of the Environmentally Preferable and Agency Preferred Alternatives.....	5-9
5.2.1	The Environmentally Preferable Alternative	5-9
5.2.2	The Agency Preferred Alternative	5-10
6.0	LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS	6-1
6.1	NEPA Evaluation Team.....	6-1
6.2	Contributors.....	6-4
7.0	LIST OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	7-1
8.0	REFERENCES	8-1
1.0	Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action.....	8-1
2.0	Alternatives Including the Proposed Action.....	8-2
3.0	Affected Environment.....	8-3
3.2	Environmental Setting	8-3
3.3	Fish	8-4
3.3.6	Marine-Derived Nutrients	8-12

3.3.7	Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon	8-17
3.3.8	Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects on Salmon.....	8-19
3.4	Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibilities	8-22
3.5	Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses	8-23
3.6	Economic Activity and Value	8-25
3.7	Environmental Justice	8-26
3.8	Wildlife.....	8-27
3.9	Ownership and Land Use.....	8-39
3.10	Water Quality.....	8-39
4.0	Environmental Consequences	8-39
4.2	Basis for Comparison of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives Analysis	8-39
4.3	Fish	8-40
4.3.5	Marine-Derived Nutrients from Spawning Salmon	8-41
4.3.6	Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon	8-42
4.3.7	Hatchery-Related Effects on Salmon: Straying and Overfishing	8-42
4.3.8	Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....	8-42
4.4	Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibility.....	8-43
4.6	Economic Activity and Value	8-43
4.7	Environmental Justice	8-43
4.8	Wildlife.....	8-44
5.0	Identification of the Environmentally Preferable and Agency Preferred Alternative	8-48
Technical Appendix C	Technical Methods, Derivation of Harvest Management Standards and Fishery Impacts.....	8-48
Technical Appendix D	Technical Methods, Economics.....	8-50

APPENDICES

A	Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Resource Management Plan.....	A-1
B	Puget Sound Chinook Population Information	B-1
C	Technical Methods – Derivation of Chinook Management Objectives and Fishery Impact Modeling Methods.....	C-1
D	Technical Methods – Economics.....	D-1
E	Technical Methods – Environmental Justice	E-1
F	Applicable Laws, Treaties, Licenses and Permits	F-1
G	Plant and Animal Database Searches.....	G-1
H	Consultation and Coordination	H-1

List of Tables

Table 1.5-1.	The fourteen salmon and steelhead Evolutionarily Significant Units included in the ESA 4(d) rule and their listing information.	1-11
Table 1.6-1.	Fraser River sockeye, pink and incidental chinook catch in Puget Sound, 1995–2001.	1-22
Table 1.6-2.	Commercial net fishery harvest of pink salmon from the Nooksack, Skagit, and Snohomish river systems, 1991–2001.	1-22
Table 1.6-3.	Landed coho salmon harvest: Puget Sound net fisheries. Regional totals include the freshwater catch.	1-23
Table 2.3-1.	Comparison of alternatives considered for detailed analysis.	2-5
Table 2.3-2.	Puget Sound chinook resource management plan harvest conservation objectives: Recovery exploitation rates, escapement goals, critical abundance thresholds, and minimum fishing rates under Alternative 1.	2-8
Table 2.3-3.	Escapement goal objectives used to analyze Alternative 2 based on objectives provided by the co-managers.	2-14
Table 2.3-4.	Escapement goal objectives used to analyze Alternative 3 based on objectives provided by the co-managers.	2-18
Table 3.2-1.	Major river systems within the four regions of the Puget Sound Action Area.	3-5
Table 3.2-2.	April 1, 2000 resident population of Puget Sound Action Area counties.	3-8
Table 3.3-1.	Summary of key characteristics of Pacific salmon species.	3-15
Table 3.3-2.	Critical escapement thresholds, viable escapement thresholds, and rebuilding exploitation rates determined by NMFS for Puget Sound chinook populations.	3-21
Table 3.3-3.	Summary of status of Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca native summer chum salmon populations.	3-65
Table 3.3-4.	Summary of environmental and harvest-related factors contributing to the decline of Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum populations in the 1970s and 1980s.	3-65
Table 3.3-5.	Summary of assessments of population status of Puget Sound coho salmon.	3-70
Table 3.3-6.	Summary of run size and escapement trends for Puget Sound wild coho population groups, 1981 through 2000.	3-71
Table 3.3.7-1.	Average age composition of the Puget Sound chinook salmon catch by gear type.	3-100
Table 3.3.7-2.	Characteristics of populations chosen for size at age analyses.	3-103
Table 3.3.7-3.	Changes in size at age and sex for selected Puget Sound chinook populations (significance level (P) = 0.10).	3-105
Table 3.3.7-4.	Changes in size at age for selected Puget Sound chinook populations (significance level (P) = 0.05).	3-107
Table 3.3.7-5.	Comparison of size at age analyses for hatchery and natural spawning escapement analysis for those population and age strata in common to both analyses.	3-109

Table 3.3.7-6.	Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm/year) and corresponding expected trends (cm/year) under directional harvest (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated strong stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 1\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 50 cm.	3-111
Table 3.3.7-7.	Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm/year) and corresponding expected trends (cm/year) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated weak stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 4\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 50 cm.	3-112
Table 3.3.7-8.	Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm yr-1) and corresponding expected trends (cm yr-1) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated strong stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 1\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 70cm.	3-113
Table 3.3.7-9.	Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm yr-1) and corresponding expected trends (cm yr-1) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated weak stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 4\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 70cm.	3-114
Table 3.6-1.	County, regional, and state industrial output by major industrial sector in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars).	3-165
Table 3.6-2.	County, regional, and state industrial output by specific industrial sectors in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars).	3-166
Table 3.6-3.	County, regional, and state employment ¹ by major industrial sector in 2000.	3-167
Table 3.6-4.	County, regional, and state employment ¹ by specific industrial sectors in 2000.	3-168
Table 3.6-5.	County, regional, and state personal income ¹ by major industrial sector in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars).	3-169
Table 3.6-6.	County, regional, and state personal income ¹ by specific industrial sectors in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars).	3-170
Table 3.7-1.	Percentage of persons below the poverty level, by county, within the target area.	3-176
Table 3.7-2.	Percentage of minority persons by county, by race, within the target area.	3-177
Table 3.7-3.	Tribes considered in the environmental justice analysis.	3-179
Table 3.8-1.	Presence and association of marine birds and mammals with the marine habitats of Puget Sound.	3-182
Table 3.8-2.	Seasonal abundance of birds and marine mammals in Puget Sound.	3-185
Table 3.9-1.	Freshwater and saltwater boat launches in the 12 counties within the Puget Sound action area.	3-207
Table 4.2-1.	Scenarios associated with estimated harvest levels within the Puget Sound Action Area.	4-8
Table 4.3-1.	Rebuilding Exploitation Rates, and critical and viable escapement standards for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal summer chum, against which impacts of Alternatives were assessed.	4-13
Table 4.3-2.	Predicted Southern U.S. catch of Puget Sound chinook populations under Alternatives 1-4 and Scenarios A-D.	4-33

Table 4.3-3.	Performance of Alternatives 1 through 4 under Scenario B relative to rebuilding exploitation rate, critical escapement threshold, and viable escapement threshold standards.	4-34
Table 4.3-4	Summary of impacts of Alternatives 2-4 relative to the proposed action under Scenario B.....	4-35
Table 4.3-5.	Performance of Alternatives 1 through 4 under Scenarios A-D relative to rebuilding exploitation rate, critical escapement threshold, and viable escapement threshold standards. ...	4-36
Table 4.3-6	Summary of impacts of Alternatives 2-4 relative to the proposed action under scenarios 1-4....	4-37
Table 4.3-7a	Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-38
Table 4.3-7b	Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-39
Table 4.3-7c	Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-40
Table 4.3-7d	Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-41
Table 4.3-8a-1	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-42
Table 4.3-8a-2	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action).....	4-42
Table 4.3-8b-1	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-43
Table 4.3-8b-2	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action).....	4-43
Table 4.3-8c-1	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-44
Table 4.3-8c-2	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action).	4-44
Table 4.3-8d-1	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-45
Table 4.3-8d-2	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action).	4-45

Table 4.3-9a-1	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-46
Table 4.3-9a-2	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action).....	4-46
Table 4.3-9b-1	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-47
Table 4.3-9b-2	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action).....	4-47
Table 4.3-9c-1	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-48
Table 4.3-9c-2	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action).	4-48
Table 4.3-9d-1	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-49
Table 4.3-9d-2	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action).	4-49
Table 4.3-10a-1	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-50
Table 4.3-10a-2	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action).....	4-50
Table 4.3-10b-1	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-51
Table 4.3-10b-2	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action).....	4-51
Table 4.3-10c-1	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-52
Table 4.3-10c-2	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action).....	4-52
Table 4.3-10d-1	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon.	4-53

Table 4.3-10d-2	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action).....	4-53
Table 4.3-11	Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon.....	4-56
Table 4.3-12a	Performance of Alternative 2 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon.....	4-58
Table 4.3-12b	Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement goal management at the management unit level) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon.....	4-59
Table 4.3-13a	Performance of Alternative 3 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon.....	4-61
Table 4.3-13b	Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement goal management at the population level) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon.	4-63
Table 4.3-14a	Performance of Alternative 4 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon.....	4-65
Table 4.3-14b	Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon.....	4-66
Table 4.3.5-1	Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 1.....	4-72
Table 4.3.5-2	Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 2.....	4-75
Table 4.3.5-3	Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 3.....	4-77
Table 4.3.5-4	Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 4.....	4-78
Table 4.3.6.1-1.	Range of expected total exploitation rates by Puget Sound chinook management unit during the period 2005–2009.....	4-83
Table 4.3.6.1-2.	Range of expected southern U.S. exploitation rates by Puget Sound chinook management unit during the period 2005–2009.....	4-84
Table 4.3.7-1.	Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives by scenario.....	4-89
Table 4.3.7-2.	Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario A.	4-90
Table 4.3.7-3.	Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario B.	4-91
Table 4.3.7-4.	Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario C.	4-92
Table 4.3.7-5.	Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario D.	4-93

Table 4.3.7-6.	Estimated 1996–2002 average number of hatchery-origin chinook salmon that spawn in the wild as a proportion of the hatchery-origin escapement for key Puget Sound chinook hatchery salmon populations under consideration (hatchery fish spawning in the wild/total hatchery fish returning).	4-95
Table 4.3.7-7.	Hatchery contribution to natural spawning escapement by scenario and alternative for five representative Puget Sound chinook populations.	4-97
Table 4.3.7-8.	Comparisons of hatchery- and natural-spawning coho salmon escapement with the proposed action and alternatives.	4-103
Table 4.3.7-9.	Comparisons of hatchery- and natural-spawning chum salmon escapement with the proposed action and alternatives.	4-103
Table 4.3.8-1.	Federal, Tribal, Washington state, and local plans, policies, and programs that influence fish within the Puget Sound Action Area: 2004.	4-111
Table 4.6-1.	Performance of economic indicators under alternatives 1-4 relative to conservation standards under scenarios 1-4.	4-146
Table 4.6-2.	Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-147
Table 4.6-3.	Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. ...	4-148
Table 4.6-4.	Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-149
Table 4.6-5.	Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-150
Table 4.6-6.	Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-151
Table 4.6-7.	Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-152
Table 4.6-8.	Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-153
Table 4.6-9.	Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-154
Table 4.6-10.	Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-155
Table 4.6-11.	Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-156
Table 4.6-12.	Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-157
Table 4.6-13.	Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-158

Table 4.6-14.	Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-159
Table 4.6-15.	Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-160
Table 4.6-16.	Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-161
Table 4.6-17.	Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries.	4-162
Table 4.6-18.	Baseline and change in net economic values of commercial salmon fishing (in millions of 2002 dollars).	4-163
Table 4.6-19.	Baseline and changes in angler days and net economic value (NEV) of salmon sport fishing in the Puget Sound area.	4-164
Table 4.6-20.	Federal, Tribal, Washington State, and local plans, policies, and programs that influence economic condition within the Puget Sound Action Area (2004).	4-167
Table 4.7-1.	Tribal salmon fishing revenue for the action area – 17 fishing tribes (estimates in thousands of dollars).	4-171
Table 4.7-2.	Selected data for potentially affected tribes.	4-173
Table 4.7-3.	Relative mortality for tribal peoples compared to residents of Washington State.	4-174
Table 4.7-4.	Estimated tribal salmon harvested annually under Alternative 1, Scenario B.	4-176
Table 4.7-5.	Estimated annual tribal salmon revenue, by species – Alternative 1, Scenario B.	4-176
Table 4.7-6.	Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 1, Scenarios A, C, or D.	4-177
Table 4.7-7.	Number of tribal salmon caught annually under Alternative 2, Scenario B.	4-178
Table 4.7-8.	Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 2, Scenarios A, C, or D.	4-180
Table 4.7-9.	Estimated tribal salmon numbers harvested annually under Alternative 3, Scenario B.	4-180
Table 4.7-10.	Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 3, Scenarios A, C, or D.	4-181
Table 4.7-11.	Estimated tribal salmon numbers harvested annually under Alternative 4, Scenario B.	4-182
Table 4.7-12.	Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 4, Scenarios A, C, or D.	4-183
Table 4.7-13.	Summary of environmental justice indicators associated with potential impacts from alternative management plans under Scenario B.	4-184
Table 4.7-14.	Federal, Tribal, Washington State, and local plans, policies, and programs predicted to have a cumulative impact on environmental justice communities within the Puget Sound Action Area (2004).	4-188
Table 4.8-6-1	Cumulative effects on wildlife of the Proposed Action in combination with various plans, policies and laws.	4-208
Table 5.1-1.	Abundance and Canadian/Alaskan fishery scenarios evaluated for each alternative.	5-2
Table 5.1-2	Comparison of predicted environmental effects among alternatives and a description of the Proposed Action for Scenario B in the order they appear in the EIS.	5-4

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1.	Washington commercial salmon management marine catch reporting areas.....	1-2
Figure 1.4-1.	Marine range of west coast chinook salmon.	1-5
Figure 1.4-2.	Fisheries management forums.	1-6
Figure 1.4-3.	Locations of federally-recognized Puget Sound treaty tribes that are parties to the proposed action.	1-8
Figure 1.6-1.	Major fishing areas in Alaska, British Columbia and the southern United States where listed Puget Sound chinook salmon are caught.	1-14
Figure 1.6-2.	Commercial net and troll catch of chinook salmon in Puget Sound, 1980–2001.	1-19
Figure 1.6-3.	Puget Sound overview.	1-21
Figure 1.6-4.	Number of chinook salmon caught in Puget Sound marine fisheries.	1-24
Figure 1.6-5.	Number of chinook salmon caught in Puget Sound freshwater recreational fisheries.	1-24
Figure 3.2-1.	The Puget Sound Action Area and regions within the action area.	3-3
Figure 3.2-2.	Washington counties within the Puget Sound Action Area.	3-4
Figure 3.2-3.	The North Puget Sound region of the Puget Sound Action Area.	3-6
Figure 3.2-4.	Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit: Land ownership pattern.	3-10
Figure 3.2-5.	Proposed demographically-independent populations in the Puget Sound Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit.....	3-12
Figure 3.2-6.	Hood Canal Summer-Run Chum Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit: Land ownership pattern.....	3-13
Figure 3.3-1.	North Puget Sound Region.	3-24
Figure 3.3-2.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Nooksack River spring chinook.	3-26
Figure 3.3-3.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skagit River summer-fall chinook.....	3-29
Figure 3.3-4.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skagit River spring chinook.....	3-31
Figure 3.3-5.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Stillaguamish River summer-fall chinook.	3-34
Figure 3.3-6.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Snohomish River summer-fall chinook.	3-35
Figure 3.3-7.	South Puget Sound Region.	3-39
Figure 3.3-8.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Lake Washington summer-fall chinook.	3-41
Figure 3.3-9.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Green-Duwamish River summer-fall chinook.	3-43

Figure 3.3-10.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for White River spring chinook.....	3-46
Figure 3.3-11.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Puyallup River fall chinook.	3-49
Figure 3.3-12.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Nisqually River fall chinook.	3-51
Figure 3.3-13.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skokomish River fall chinook.	3-53
Figure 3.3-14.	Strait of Juan de Fuca Region.	3-56
Figure 3.3-15.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Dungeness River spring chinook.....	3-58
Figure 3.3-16.	Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Elwha River summer-fall chinook.	3-60
Figure 3.3-17.	Summer chum salmon spawning escapement to the Big Quilcene, other west Hood Canal streams, and east Hood Canal streams, 1968 –2001.....	3-63
Figure 3.3-18.	Summer chum salmon spawning escapement to Strait of Juan de Fuca streams, 1971–2001..	3-64
Figure 3.3.7-1.	Age composition of Puget Sound chinook salmon catch: relatively stable since 1980.	3-100
Figure 3.3.7-2.	Age composition of Puget Sound chinook salmon escapement: stable since the 1970s.....	3-101
Figure 3.5-1.	Location of federally-recognized Puget Sound Indian tribes that are parties to the proposed action.	3-129
Figure 3.6-1.	Annual average ex-vessel value of commercial salmon landed at Puget Sound ports between 1991 and 1998, by county.....	3-146
Figure 3.6-2.	Annual average catch (tribal and non-tribal) and ex-vessel value of commercially-caught salmon in Puget Sound between 1991 and 2000.	3-147
Figure 3.6-3.	Percent of the annual average commercially-caught salmon in Puget Sound between 1991 and 2000, by marine catch area (in pounds landed).....	3-148
Figure 3.6-4.	Action and impact analysis area for the Puget Sound Harvest Management Plan.	3-150
Figure 3.6-5.	Percent of annual average commercially-caught (tribal and non-tribal) harvest of salmon in freshwater areas of Puget Sound.	3-151
Figure 3.6-6.	Annual average catch and ex-vessel value of salmon harvested by tribes in Puget Sound (1991-2000).	3-153
Figure 3.6-7.	Annual average sport catch (number of fish caught) of salmon in marine and freshwater areas of Puget Sound, by species (1991-2000).....	3-156
Figure 3.6-8.	Salmon ports and major launch areas in North Puget Sound region.	3-157
Figure 3.6-9.	Salmon ports and major launch areas in South Puget Sound/South Hood Canal region.	3-158
Figure 3.6-10.	Salmon ports and major launch areas in the Strait of Juan de Fuca/North Hood Canal region.	3-159

Glossary

4(d) Rule	Regulations adopted by the Secretary of Commerce that he/she deems necessary and advisable for the conservation of threatened species. For this document, the 4(d) Rule specifically means those regulations published by NMFS on July 10, 2000 for fourteen listed salmon ESUs.
Action area	See Puget Sound Action Area, below.
Adjudicated fishing rights	Fishing rights of federally-recognized Indian tribes that have been established pursuant to court decree.
Adverse impact	An impact that has a negative consequence.
Alleles	Location in the genetic material (DNA) where genetic traits are carried. The type and frequency of the alleles in a population constitutes the genetic diversity of the population.
Alternatives	Reasonable actions that fit the purpose and need for the Proposed Action.
Angler days	Trips by sport fishermen.
Annex	The detailed agreements that implement the principles of the Pacific Salmon Treaty.
Asymptote	A straight line approached by a given curve as one of the variables in the equation of the curve approaches infinity.
Authorized take	Take of a listed species defined in the ESA as “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct” conducted in a manner approved by the federal agency with jurisdiction over that listed species; i.e., NMFS or USFWS.
Bag limit	The number of fish allowed to be harvested in recreational fisheries within a certain time frame, e.g., angler trip. It may also be measured relative to another species; e.g., two salmon, only one of which is a chinook.
Beneficial impact	An impact that has a positive consequence.
Blackmouth	Immature chinook salmon.
Brood year	The year in which returning salmon adults spawn or the year in which the parents of a group of fish of the same age spawned.
Bycatch	Unintentional capture of marine birds or mammals during fisheries using any of a variety of gear types.
Carcass biomass	The volume of spawning salmon, measured in this document by spawner abundance.
Ceremonial uses	Salmon is a traditional food of Puget Sound Native American tribes. Examples of ceremonies that require traditional meals, including salmon, are: winter ceremonials, naming ceremonies, giveaways and feasts, and funerals.
Cetaceans	Whales, dolphins, porpoise.

Chinook-directed fisheries	Fisheries with the objective of harvesting chinook salmon.
Coded-wire tags	Minute, implanted tags in a portion of hatchery-reared salmon that reveal information about their origin.
Cohorts	Fish of a given age and stock at the beginning of a particular year of life.
Co-managers	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Puget Sound Treaty Tribes.
Commingle	To mix together.
Critical escapement threshold	A level of escapement below which extinction risk increases substantially.
Cumulative impact	The impact on the environment that would result from the incremental effects of the proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (CEQ 1508.7).
Current-condition escapement threshold	The number of spawners that meet the productivity and capacity constraints of a given river system.
Depensatory mortality	Mortality that occurs at very low population abundance that has the affect of destabilizing or further destabilizing the population.
Depressed population	A population whose production is below expected levels based on available habitat and natural variations in survival rates, but above the level where permanent damage to the population is likely.
Direct effect	An effect that would be caused by the proposed action or alternatives and occur at the same time and place as the action. Direct effects typically arise from construction activities, and may also occur from operations associated with the proposed action or alternatives (40CFR 1508.8[a]).
Disproportionate effect	An incidence (or prevalence) of an effect, a risk of an effect, or likely exposure to environmental hazards that would potentially cause adverse effects on a minority and/or low income population that significantly exceeds that experienced by a comparable reference population – a form of effects analysis used in the Environmental Justice subsection (4.7).
Diurnal foraging	Daytime foraging.
Endangered species	The ESA defines a threatened species as “any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range other than a species of the Class <i>Insecta</i> determined by the Secretary to constitute a pest whose protection under the provisions of this Act would present an overwhelming and overriding risk to man.”
Escapement	The number of spawning adult salmon that return to a particular geographic area.
Escapement floor	The number of spawning adult salmon for a population or management unit that harvest management actions are designed to meet or exceed.

Escapement goal	A management objective expressed as the number of fish returning to natural or artificial (hatchery) spawning areas.
Escapement goal management	A harvest management strategy whereby fisheries are managed to achieve an escapement goal(s).
Estuarine habitat	Tidal flats and river mouths (like Padilla Bay and the mouth of the Nooksack River).
Exploitation	Harvest.
Exploitation rate	The total mortality in a fishery or aggregate of fisheries expressed as the proportion of the un-fished cohort removed by fishing.
Exploitation rate ceiling	The maximum exploitation rate allowed for a population or management unit. A ceiling differs from a target in that fisheries are not managed to achieve the ceiling, but generally to fall below it.
Ex-vessel value	The dollar value that commercial fishermen receive for their product once it leaves the fishing vessel.
Fecundity	Fertility. For salmon, fecundity is measured as the number of eggs produced per female.
Federal trust responsibility	Duties and responsibilities of the federal government to manage the property and natural resources of the Tribes for the benefit of the Tribes.
Federally-recognized tribes	Any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe. The Secretary of the Interior is required to publish an annual list of such tribes in the Federal Register (25 USC sections 479a and 479a-1).
Fingerlings	Actively-feeding juvenile salmon within river systems.
Fishing regime	The specific group of fishery actions/regulations that are taken to achieve fishery management objectives.
Fry	Newly-emerged salmon.
Genetic diversity	The variation in inherited traits.
Genetic integrity	Maintenance of unique genetic characteristics of a population.
Genome	The genetic material (DNA, chromosomes) contained in living cells.
Ghost net	Fishing nets, especially gillnets, that have been lost but continue to capture fish, marine birds, marine mammals and crabs.
Harvest	Fish killed as a result of encounters with fishing gear.
Harvest rate	Total fishing mortality in a fishery expressed as a proportion of the total fish abundance available (standing stock) in a given fishing area at the start of a time period.
Hatchery-origin fish	Fish whose parents spawned or were spawned in a hatchery.
Hatchery-spawning fish	Same as hatchery-origin fish.

Healthy population	A population experiencing production levels consistent with its available habitat and within the natural variations in survival for the population.
Hood Canal region	For purposes of this analysis, the Hood Canal region includes Jefferson, Kitsap and Mason Counties, and the following river systems: Skokomish, Hamma Hamma, Dosewallips, Duckabush, Big Quilcene, and Little Quilcene.
Hook-and-line fishery	Fisheries that use hook-and-line gear, e.g., troll and sport fisheries, to catch fish.
Hook-ups	The occurrence of catching marine birds in hook-and-line sport fisheries.
Incidental catch	Fish captured during a fishery targeted at another species.
Incidental take	Accidental harm or death caused to a threatened or endangered species during a fishery targeted at another species.
Indicator populations	Hatchery produced salmon that are marked with coded-wire tags and are used to represent associated wild spawning populations.
Indirect effect	Reasonably foreseeable effects that would be caused by the proposed action or alternatives, but which would occur later in time or further removed from the project site or action area than direct effects. Indirect effects may also include those resulting from actions that may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the lead agency believes the effect will be beneficial. Indirect effects may be growth-inducing or otherwise related to changes in land use patterns, population density, or growth rate, and may affect air quality, water, and/or other natural systems (40CFR 1508.8[b]).
Inland marine deeper water habitat	Marine waters of Puget Sound greater than 66 feet deep.
Listed species	Species listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered.
Low effect	Measurable but of small amount or occurs infrequently.
Marine Catch Areas	Geographic areas in marine and freshwaters defined for the purposes of reporting catch.
Marine-derived nutrients	The input of nutrients into freshwater systems associated with the return, death and decomposition of adult salmon.
Management unit	A population or group of populations aggregated for the purpose of achieving a management objective.
Marine shelf habitat	Deepwater habitat of the Strait of Juan de Fuca west of a line from the mouth of the Elwha River north to Race Rocks on the southern tip of Vancouver Island, influenced by oceanic currents.
Mesocosm	Communities in the middle or community structure that transitions from one layer to another, e.g., rock-insect-fish.
Moderate effect	Measurable at some level between low and substantial.
Morphology	The form and structure of an organism.

Morphological	Pertaining to the form and structure of an organism.
Mortality	Number or amount of salmon killed.
Natal stream	Stream of origin.
Natural escapement	The number of fish spawning in the wild regardless of whether their parents spawned in the wild or in a hatchery.
Naturally-spawning	Spawning in the wild.
Nearshore marine habitat	Marine areas of Puget Sound between high tide and the end of the photic zone (66 feet depth).
Net economic value to commercial fishermen	The amount of total revenues received by vessel operators less the costs of production, including wages, operational expenses (like fuel and equipment), and fixed costs (such as insurance and depreciation).
Net economic value for sport anglers	The amount anglers would be willing to pay over and above what they actually pay is the measure of net economic value (or the value received) to anglers.
No effect	Not measurable and/or expected, or of such a rare occurrence that it is impossible to measure or detect.
North Hood Canal	The Economic Activity analysis of this Environmental Assessment addresses North Hood Canal (Jefferson County) and Clallam County in a subregion identified as Strait of Juan de Fuca/North Hood Canal.
North Puget Sound region	For purposes of this analysis, the North Puget Sound region includes Snohomish, Skagit, Whatcom, Island and San Juan Counties, and the following river systems: Nooksack, Samish, Skagit, Stillaguamish, and Snohomish.
Nutrient loading	The nutrients released into a system proportional to carcass density.
Otoliths	Bones in the head of a fish that indicate age.
Out-of-watershed-origin chinook	Chinook originating from a watershed other than that in which they are found, or chinook originating from a watershed other than that under discussion.
Population areal unit	The geopolitical unit used for purposes of the Environmental Justice analysis. Contains the populations used to define the target area: by county.
Precocious	Age-2 fish.
Productivity of systems	The survival rate of a population from a particular watershed from one life stage to another measured after taking into consideration mortality occurring during that period, e.g., juveniles produced per spawning adult.
Progeny	Offspring of spawning salmon.
Proposed Action	The Puget Sound chinook harvest management framework proposed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Puget Sound Treaty Tribes (co-managers).

Puget Sound Action Area	All marine waters of the State of Washington east of, and including, the Strait of Juan de Fuca; all State of Washington freshwater tributaries to these marine waters east of the Strait of Juan de Fuca; the freshwater tributaries of the Strait of Juan de Fuca east of, and including, the Elwha River drainage; and the counties that border these waters.
Pulsed openings	Fishery openings scheduled for short duration. These openings are generally scheduled throughout the period over which salmon move through an area so that harvest is not focused on any one segment of the run.
Rebuilding exploitation rate	A harvest objective used by NMFS that defines the level of salmon fishery exploitation that would result in a low probability that the harvest action will endanger the population, and a relatively high probability that it will not impede recovery.
Recovery exploitation rate	A harvest objective used by the co-managers that defines the level of salmon fishery exploitation that would result in a low probability that the harvest action will endanger the population, and a relatively high probability that it will not impede recovery.
Recruits	The number of salmon in an the unfished cohort produced from a single brood year (parental escapement).
Redds	“Nests” constructed by salmon in gravel.
Redd superimposition	A phenomena that occurs when later arriving adult spawners spawn in the same places as earlier arriving adult spawners, in effect, digging up redds dug by previous spawners. This generally causes significant mortality to the eggs laid by the previous spawners.
Reference area	For purposes of the Environmental Justice analysis in this Environmental Assessment, the reference area is the State of Washington.
Resource management plan	A plan that includes a process, specific regulations, management objectives or other information required to manage a natural resource. For this document, the natural resource would be salmon.
Run timing	The time over which a population or group of populations move through or into an area, e.g., the time over which adults return to the spawning grounds.
Salmonids	All fishes belonging to the taxonomic family <i>Salmonidae</i> ; i.e., salmon and trout.
Smolts	Actively-feeding juvenile salmon, physiologically ready to migrate to salt water.
Smolting	Transitional life stage of juvenile salmon at the point where they move from fresh water to salt water; may occur in a river or within an estuary.
South Hood Canal	The Economic Activity analysis of this Environmental Assessment addresses South Hood Canal (Mason and Kitsap counties) and South Puget Sound (King, Pierce and Thurston counties) in a subregion identified as South Puget Sound/South Hood Canal.

South Puget Sound region	For purposes of this analysis, the South Puget Sound region includes King, Pierce, and Thurston Counties, and the following river systems: Cedar, Green/Duwamish, Puyallup, Nisqually, Deschutes, and Shelton.
Southern U.S. fisheries	Chinook salmon fisheries occurring in Puget Sound and off the Pacific coast of Washington, Oregon and California.
Spawner density	The number of spawning salmon per area of spawning habitat.
Spawning escapement	The number of sexually-mature adults returning to spawning grounds.
Strait of Juan de Fuca region	For purposes of this analysis, the Strait of Juan de Fuca region includes Clallam County and the following river systems: Elwha and Dungeness.
Stratum	Sampling groups.
Straying	The occurrence of some hatchery-origin fish failing to return to the hatchery at the time of spawning.
Straying rate	The proportion of total hatchery-origin escapement not removed from the natural environment through trapping, or the number of hatchery-origin salmon that otherwise strayed from their point of release.
Subsistence uses	The ways in which indigenous people utilize the environment and the resources it provides (such as salmon) to meet the nutritional needs of the members of the society.
Substantial effect	A high impact that is measurable and/or expected, or likely to occur more frequently than anticipated.
Sub-yearlings	Juvenile salmonids that migrate as fingerlings.
Take	The ESA defines take as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, import or export, ship in interstate commerce in the course of commercial activity, or sell or offer for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife species listed as endangered, without written authorization.
Take prohibition	Ban of take.
Target area	The geographical study area for purposes of the Environmental Justice analysis; synonymous with the Puget Sound Action Area in this case.
Target population	The potentially affected residents of each county within the target area.
Terminal areas	Locations containing only populations that return to a single river system.
Terminal fisheries	Freshwater fisheries only; i.e., within rivers and lakes.
Terminal net fisheries	Freshwater fisheries that use net fishing gear; e.g., drift gill nets, set gill nets, beach seines, dip nets.
Threatened species	The ESA defines a threatened species as “any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.”
Transport vectors	Stream flow, stream channel structure, and similar factors.
Unlisted species	Species that have not been listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered

Usual and accustomed fishing areas	Traditional Indian fishing grounds so designated through judicial process. Defined in the Boldt Decision (383 Federal Supplement 312: 313) as every fishing location where members of an Indian tribe customarily fished from time to time at and before treaty times, however distant the then-usual habitat of the tribe, and whether or not other tribes then also fished in the same waters.
U.S. v. Washington	Commonly referred to as “The Boldt decision”, U.S. v Washington is the on-going Federal court proceeding that enforces and implements reserved treaty fishing rights with regard to salmon and steelhead returning to Western Washington.
Viable escapement threshold	A level of escapement that would generally indicate recovery or a point beyond which ESA protection is no longer required.
Viable Salmonid Population guidelines	Generic values or descriptive guidelines for abundance, productivity, spatial structure and diversity provided by NMFS in Viable Salmonid Populations and the Recovery of Evolutionarily Significant Units (McElhany et al., 2000) used as one factor in assessing the status of population where population-specific information is not available.
Wild exploitation rate	The total mortality in a fishery or aggregate of fisheries expressed as the proportion of the un-fished cohort whose parents spawned the wild that are removed by fishing.
Wild-origin fish	Fish whose parents spawned in the wild
Yearlings	Juvenile salmon that have reared at least one year in freshwater